

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,831	01/05/2004	Sadanand V. Deshpande	FIS920030078US2 (16422A)	3568
23389 SCULLY SCO	7590 07/26/200 OTT MURPHY & PRES	EXAMINER		
400 GARDEN	CITY PLAZA	WOJCIECHOWICZ,	WOJCIECHOWICZ, EDWARD JOSEPH	
SUITE 300 GARDEN CIT	Y, NY 11530		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2815	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		•				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/751,831	DESHPANDE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Edward Wojciechowicz	2815			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHICI - Extens after S - If NO - Failure Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be still apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
1)⊠ ∣	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 April 2007</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition	on of Claims					
5)	Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are pending in the application la) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.				
Application	on Papers					
10)□ T , ,	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the d Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected.	epted or b) objected to by the Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. S on is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice 3) Inform	s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summal Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/751,831

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22, 24-26, 28, 33, 35, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 22 and 33, the exact location of the areas under stress is not clearly defined. These claims refer to the first and second semiconductor areas, the extent of which is not defined. It is not clear which parts of these areas, (e.g. relative to the trench isolation regions), is under compression stress.

In claims 22-26, 35 and 36, the recitation as to the presence or absence of a "bird's beak structure" is unclear since this "structure" has not been fully defined relative to the specific trench isolation regions claimed.

In claims 28 and 38, since the second sidewall has already been described as having a nitride layer thereon, the exact location of the additional oxide layer formed on the second sidewall is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandelman in view of Divakaruni and Pucher, all of record, and newly cited reference to Yeo et al (2004/0212035). The explanation of the Mandelman, Divakaruni and Pucher references is hereby incorporated by reference

from the previous actions. The reference to Yeo is cited to address applicants' remarks that all of the sidewalls of the previously cited references have the same composition. As see, in Yeo, for example in FIG. 10, and discussed in para. [0073], the sidewalls of isolation trenches in a first semiconductor area (212b) are void of any nitride liners, while the sidewalls of isolation trenches in a second semiconductor area (212a) have nitride liners present, as claimed.

As taught by Yeo, the presence or absence of such nitride liners can be used to tailor the different stress levels throughout the substrate. One skilled in the art would be able to adjust the compressive and tensile stresses so as to optimize device performance between NFET and PFET devices.

Taken together, the cited references appear to teach all of the claimed features of the invention, and one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine these references to achieve optimal device characteristics.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Wojciechowicz whose telephone number is 571-272-1739. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward Wojciechowicz Primary Examiner